REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-50 in the application. In previous responses, the Applicants amended Claims 1-4, 8-10, 21-22, 28, 30, 39, 41, 43, 45 and 49-50 and added Claims 51-52. In the present preliminary amendment, the Applicants have not canceled or added any claims but have amended independent Claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, Claims 1-52 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,112,183 to Swanson, *et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,294 to Simmon, *et al.* The cited combination does not, however, teach or suggest each and every element of amended independent Claims 1, 21 and 41 and Claims dependent thereon. More specifically, the cited combination does not teach or suggest retrieving data for a requested value from a data processing system when determining accessing multiple entries of the data stored in an ancillary system is required before processing the data into the value.

Swanson teaches client stubs 60 are responsible for locating a server to handle a request. (*See* column 7, lines 1-14.) The Examiner asserted that this suggests determining whether or not a request can be processed at the requested server and, if not, then the server requests additional record data from other servers for completing the request. (*See* page 3 of Examiner's Action mailed March 22, 2006.) Even considering the Examiner's assumption to be correct, Swanson still does not retrieve the data from a data processing system when determining that accessing multiple servers is needed. Instead, Swanson simply obtains additional records (*i.e.*, the data) from the

other servers to complete the request. Therefore, according to the Examiner's assumption, Swanson suggests accessing multiple servers for additional records when determining additional records are needed. Swanson, therefore, neither teaches nor suggests retrieving data for a requested value from a data processing system when determining accessing multiple entries of the data stored in an ancillary system is required before processing the data into the value as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 21.

The Examiner applies Simmon to provide additional support for Swanson. Simmon, however, like Swanson, simply determines where desired information is stored. (*See* column 4, lines 45-53.) Simmon provides no teaching or suggestion of determining the accessibility of data to fulfill a request. More particularly, Simmon provides no teaching or suggestion of retrieving data for a requested value from a data processing system when determining accessing multiple entries of the data stored in an ancillary system is required before processing the data into the value as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 21.

Thus, Simmon does not cure the above noted deficiency of Swanson. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, the cited combination of Swanson and Simmon fails to teach or suggest each element of the invention recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 21 and Claims dependent thereon. The cited combination, therefore, does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 1-40.

Regarding independent Claim 41, the Examiner asserts that Swanson teaches each element thereof. (*See* page 7 of Examiner's Action mailed March 22, 2006.) The Applicants, however, do not find where Swanson teaches or suggests transferring data from a plurality of ancillary systems to an enterprise database based on whether accessing multiple entries of data stored in an ancillary

system is required before processing the data into a value for a data item as recited in independent Claim 41. On the contrary, the Applicants do not even find where Swanson addresses transferring data. Instead, Swanson is directed to employing a common interface to obtain data for processing health care transactions in a distributed computing environment. (*See* column 1, lines 8-12.) Swanson, therefore, has no need to transfer data since Swanson relies on the common interface to obtain the needed data. As such, Swanson neither teaches nor suggests each element of independent Claim 41. Simmon has not been cited to cure this deficiency of Swanson. Thus, the cited combination of Swanson and Simmon does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claim 41 and Claims dependent thereon.

Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, the cited combination of Swanson and Simmon fails to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 1-52. Thus, Claims 1-52 are not unpatentable in view of the cited combination. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-52 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-52.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: August 22, 2006

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800